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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written manuscript that seeks to explain the role of scientific evidence in informing adoption decisions of complex innovations in cancer care using an explanatory, multiple case study design. The authors highlight the importance of additional types of evidence that influence adoption decisions, including "real-world" data, underscoring the need for more pragmatic and implementation studies that examine implementation outcomes, including costs.

A number of methodological issues should be addressed. First, the authors should describe the timelines for each of the cases. Namely, in what year was the adoption decision made and in what year were key informant interviews conducted for each case? This information would be important to understand issues with recall. Additionally, the authors should elaborate on who key informants were and their specific roles in each of the case studies. Finally, the authors should describe how they integrated and operationalized CFIR in their study.

While the authors note limitations of their study, they also should mention the limited generalizability of their cross-case analysis given that all five cases were set in Nova Scotia.
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